

REMARKS

Claims 39-45 and 47-53 were pending and rejected. With this Amendment, independent claims 39 and 47, and 49 and 52 are amended, and claims 55-58 are added.

Claims 47-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. These claims have been amended to recite computer program code that provides an online group-buying sale, “when employed as a computer component,” in accordance with MPEP 2106.01. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallakoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,343) in view of Ross (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,135). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims in their current form are patentable over these references.

Independent claims 39 and 47 each recite, “receiving from [a] referring website a request for information comprising a tag associated with the referring website.” In an embodiment, the tag can be used in “selecting an on-line group buying sale” for the referring website. Such a selection can be performed efficiently, in real-time, based on information communicated by the tag as part of the request. Use of the tag may also make the selection process more precise than through keyword or other criterion alone.

Neither of the references suggests or discloses receiving “a request for information comprising a tag associated with the referring website” and “responsive to [] the tag, selecting for a referring website an on-line group buying sale” as claimed. In fact a word search of both references for the word “tag” yields no results. While Ross, for instance, discloses various types of “automated” and other requests, none of the disclosed requests comprises a tag that is then used in a selection process as claimed. Similarly, while “purchase requests” are disclosed by Pallakoff, none of these comprise the element of a

“tag,” or “selecting for a referring website an on-line group buying sale” responsive to the tag as claimed. For at least this reason, independent claims 39 and 47, and the claims that depend from them, are patentable over the references.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above, the early allowance of all claims is hereby requested. If Examiner believes that direct contact with the Applicants’ attorney will advance the prosecution of this case, Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned as indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
TOM VAN HORN *et al.*

Dated: 11/28/07

By: /Colleen Chien/
Colleen V. Chien, Reg. No. 55,062
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2319
Fax: (415) 281-1350
Email: cchien@fenwick.com